

T01W06 / Public policies for hybrid governance

Topic : T01 / Policy Process, Policy Making, Policy Implementation

Chair : Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Second Chair : Jarmo Vakkuri (Tampere University, Faculty of Management and Business)

Third Chair : Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

CALL FOR PAPERS

This panel invites both conceptual and empirical contributions that explore various facets of the policies on hybridity and hybridisation of societies, in view of their implications on public policy analysis.

Papers may address (among other possibilities) the following issues and questions:

What is the impact of public policies on hybridity? Do public policies increase hybrid forms of governance? Why? How?

Empirical approaches to assessing the way in which policies approach hybridity: How is it different from governing public agencies or private enterprises? Are there differences in governing or regulating hybrids across policy fields?

How does the existing literature on governing hybrids enable us to see hybrids as a novel subject for public policies?

A comparison of the perspectives on 'hybridization' vs. 'policies on hybridity' adopted by policy relevant research and practical policy action: What new aspects does hybridity impose on the shaping of the agenda-setting and policy formation?

How do different types of hybrids (e.g. state-owned enterprises, social enterprises, universities) adapt to public policies? How do community self- and co-regulating practices in tandem with corporate social responsibility and entrepreneurial self-regulation influence public policies? What is the significance of the different perspectives?

To what extent do the emerging modes of governance centred on the role of users (co-production and co-creation) affect hybrid arrangements in the design of policy solutions?

A global and transnational perspective on hybridity: Are there differences between hybrid formation across countries? Are there differences in the configuration of different forms of hybridity (i.e. between public private and community developments)? Are there different trajectories that lead to the hybridisation of nation states and development of global formation of hybrids?

What lessons have we learnt on how hybridity shapes policy design and resilience in the context of wicked problems and global crisis like COVID-19?

The objective of the panel is to initiate either a special issue or an edited volume on the topic of "Public policies for hybrid governance". Moreover, this panel continues the work that we started in the prior session at ICPP5 conference, in July 2021. In that session, the need and interest for a common special issue or edited book on the topic was systematically emphasized.

The session chairs are: Tero Erkkilä, Jan-Erik Johanson, Romulo Pinheiro and Jarmo Vakkuri

ABSTRACT

This panel "Policies for hybrid governance", investigates the dynamic and complex relationship, rationalities (implicit and/or explicit) and tensions and dilemmas among public, private and civic domains contributing to policy outcomes. While all these domains have a role in how intended aims of public policies ultimately transpire, governments have fundamental problems with understanding why, how and with what impacts this occurs. The problem is even more pronounced with the interplay between these domains that we conceptualize as hybridity. By hybridity we refer to the interaction among public, private and civil society via distinct modes of ownership, parallel but often competing institutional logics, diverse funding bases and various forms of social and institutional control (Skelcher and Smith 2015; Grossi et al. 2017, Vakkuri & Johanson 2020).

T01W06 / Public policies for hybrid governance

Chair : Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Second Chair : Jarmo Vakkuri (Tampere University, Faculty of Management and Business)

Third Chair : Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

Session 1

Tuesday, June 28th 10:00 to 12:00 (C107)

(Virtual) Social enterprise policy in the Netherlands: the challenges of creating an enabling ecosystem for hybrid organizations

Philip Karré (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

Social enterprises (SEs) are hybrid organizations that mix economic and social value creation (Mair & Martí, 2006) and can broadly be defined as “organizations combining aspects of business and charity” (Battilana & Lee, 2014, p. 406). SEs can play an important role in social innovation (Anheier et al., 2018; Brandsen et al., 2016; Karré, 2018), as they use an entrepreneurial outlook to achieve societal, environmental, or community objectives (Audretsch et al., 2020).

Enabling ecosystems can help social enterprises thrive. They provide them with “the power, means, opportunity and authority to pursue their final objectives of benefiting society” (Biggeri et al., 2017, pp. 300–301) and are made up by “contextual factors supporting, and constraining, social enterprise” (Bruin & Teasdale, 2019, p. 6), including supportive governments and policies which contribute to visibility and recognition (Diaz Gonzalez & Dentchev, 2021).

In my contribution, I will take a closer look at social enterprise policy in the Netherlands and how governments on the national and local level are trying to create an enabling ecosystem to accommodate them. I will especially focus on the challenges social enterprise’s hybridity poses in this process. Earlier research showed that relations between SE and governments can be strained, as governments often do not know what to make of SEs due to their often diffuse and ambiguous mission and their different institutional logics (Karré & Van Meerkerk, 2018; Karré, 2021a, 2021b). Yet, there is the sense that SE can help governments achieve their goals, especially in tackling social challenges.

I plan to use insights from Historical Institutionalism to reconstruct the Dutch policy towards SE and insights from Discursive Institutionalism to reconstruct the SE debate in the Netherlands and what that means for the development of the ecosystem. By doing so, I aim to describe and analyse the challenges policy makers face in creating enabling ecosystems for hybrid organizations.

At the moment, I expect to present online.

Public, private or hybrid? Project actors depicting their role in EU Cohesion policy projects

Kanerva Kuokkanen (University of Helsinki)

Isak Vento (University of Helsinki)

Projects, in parallel with other forms of temporary organization, have proliferated in the public sector of welfare states during the last decades, as they are hoped to produce organizational development, cross-sectoral problem solving, and tailored and targeted policy implementation. Although labelled public projects, they often receive both public and private funding, they can be implemented by actors coming from the public, private and third sectors, they often serve both public and private ends and include a diverse set of stakeholders. While there is a strengthening literature on the governance of hybrid organizations, less emphasis is put on how project actors position themselves between the public, private and third sector, how this is seen in their professional roles and what kind of hybrid logics of action emerge as result. This paper analyzes the question by looking at EU Cohesion policy projects implemented in two Finnish regions. Our theoretical framework is based on the research literature on collaborative governance and public sector projectification, combined with the perspectives of professionalization, hybrid organizations and street-level

bureaucracy. Our empirical analysis draws on a qualitative content analysis of semi-structured interviews with project managers and stakeholders representing the public, private and third sectors, as well as public officials in charge of the implementation of the EU's Cohesion policy in Finland. According to our analysis, there is variation in the way in which the project actors see their professional role, which is partly related to their background organizations. However, projects also strengthen the profession of project managers independently of the organizational background. Moreover, they broaden the professional role of municipal officials from administration and the implementation of laws towards more discretion and development-oriented work.

Kanerva Kuokkanen will probably present on-site, but this depends on regulations related to COVID-19.

Keywords: projects, projectification, hybrid organizations, public sector organizations, collaborative governance

Hybridization of Healthcare and the Welfare States

Petra Kokko (University of Tampere)

The Bismarckian social insurance laws from the 1880s, the Beveridgean National Health Service from 1948, and the evolvement of the Nordic countries welfare model during the 1970s have served as reference points for the development of European welfare systems. Welfare systems are interdependent and regularly social policies from one country serve as a role model for other countries. Despite similar challenges and reference points, welfare states are diverse, consistently being challenged by both exogenous and endogenous factor. The effects from policy level spill over to public sector where governance reforms are continuous, seeking more efficiency, economy, performance or fairness through transparency.

Healthcare systems battle increasing costs due to population ageing and longevity. New care concepts, tools and models aligning value-based healthcare (VBHC) and hybrid forms of governance aim to solve these challenges. Therefore, hybridity has become relevant in healthcare as countries seek new approaches and models for cost-efficient patient-centered care while maintaining service quality. Defining elements of hybridity are fulfilled when ownership, funding, incongruent goals or forms of control are mixed, combined or legitimized into something new normally found separate. Value-based healthcare is a widely approved logic for financing services, using innovative care models and evaluating healthcare outcomes. It is consistent with the Triple Aim framework of simultaneously improving population health, patient experience and the costs of care. According the literature VBHC logics have affected Nordic welfare policies. Particularly in publicly financed systems, VBHC indicates a transformation to a new public governance ideology, accelerating policy goals that promote customer responsiveness and value creation for citizens. VBHC shifts the focus of healthcare from volume to value and is a recent megatrend in the industry. The shift from 'volume to value' can also be considered a value-creation mechanism or a reflection of external, institutional pressures imposed by recent policy and management trends to retain legitimacy.

The VBHC movement has influenced the evolvement of health systems, at least in the Western welfare context, and the Triple Aim framework has gained increasing interest in performance assessment of national-level health policies. More research is needed to fully comprehend the Triple Aim framework and how VBHC strategies can be measured. The findings in a recent literature state, that evidence of the desirable impact of value-based movement is elusive, and although it is a globally implemented concept, research on its impact at the health system level is insufficient. This study aims to describe, analyze and build a conceptual bridge between the idea of value-based healthcare, welfare states' transformation and emergence of hybridity in the public healthcare governance. The purpose is to describe how the idea of VBHC became a part the Nordic health policy and analyze the influence of exogenous and endogenous factors on the transformation and how it further affects the development of healthcare governance.

Understanding Hybridity in Cyber Governance: The case of cyber crisis preparedness

Jieqiong WU (Universität Konstanz)

The given article aims to investigate the complex relationship and interaction modes among state-, non-state, and civic actors in cyber governance. Cyberspace is a domain that is primarily developed and maintained by private businesses. States are too late to intervene in this domain and therefore cyberspace is a stakeholder-centred structure, instead of a state-centric one. Governments, in this context, are no more than at best a 'primus inter pares' among other actors. Besides, the implications of cyber threats go beyond governmental institutions and geographic borders while capacities, responsibilities and resources are distributed widely and unevenly in the cyber domain. As a result, states require support and cooperation from non-state players such as international organizations, commercial corporations, civil society, and even individuals in order to achieve a safe and resilient cyber environment.

However, security studies identified there is a constant disparity between private economic interests and national security interests in this case. On the one hand, the private sector has consistently expressed an aversion to accepting responsibility or liability for national security. They regard cybersecurity challenges as financial and reputational rather than as a common public good, which is how governments regard national cybersecurity. Therefore, the private sector accepts responsibility for securing their systems to the extent that it is profitable while arguing that it is the government that should be responsible for larger cyber threats such as organized crime, terrorism, and nation-state threats.

On the other hand, the state is understood to be responsible for the provision of national security. If responsibility and accountability can be passed through a market-driven approach and shared with private actors, the legitimacy of public institutions and the central principle that political leaders and governments are held to account for are undermined.

Besides, despite some scholars having discussed public-private partnerships and their unique problems in the application in cybersecurity, the cooperation forms, processes, mechanisms, and interaction patterns among actors in cyber governance practices largely remain unknown.

This article, focusing on the case of cyber crisis preparedness policies and arrangements, aims to contribute to the aforementioned gaps, by answering three overarching research questions:

1. What types of hybrids, including formal and informal ones, exist in cyber crisis preparedness? How do these hybrids form? How do the hybrids involve in and shape the (national) cyber crisis preparedness policy-making process?
2. What are the government's strategies and policies to engage different non-state actors in cyber crisis preparedness? How do governments solve the constant disparity between private economic interests and national security interests in cyber crisis preparedness policies?
3. On what grounds do actors evaluate the success prospects of the state and non-state actor cooperation?

We will use case study methods and interview and survey data to answer these research questions.

Cyberspace governance is complex and controversial. The decentralized nature of the environment which is largely owned by the private sector and operated by the private companies, but which attracts and concerns governments and civil society, challenges traditional methods of governance and blurs the boundaries between previously distinct policy entities. We believe the investigation of actor interaction in the cyber domain could enrich the workshop discussion.

I would like to participate in the conference in person.

T01W06 / Public policies for hybrid governance

Chair : Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Second Chair : Jarmo Vakkuri (Tampere University, Faculty of Management and Business)

Third Chair : Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

Session 2

Tuesday, June 28th 14:00 to 17:00 (C107)

Beyond cosultocracy and servants of power: explaining the involvement and role of consulting firms in policy formulation

Reut Marciano (University of Toronto)

Beyond cosultocracy and servants of power: explaining the involvement and role of consulting firms in policy formulation

An expanding body of empirical research shows that consulting firms are increasingly involved in public policy formulation in various jurisdictions. Research still grapples with the drivers this trend - why are governments using consultants for policy formulation work, allegedly outsourcing one of the core strengths and responsibilities of the executive? What produces the different forms and arrangements of involving the private sector in this aspect of the policy process? Through a comparative study, this paper considers two main drivers for the routine inclusion of consulting firm in policy formulation process: gaps in policy analytical capacity and fragmentation of the policy sector. The paper compares the role of consulting firms in two policy subsystems: healthcare in Ontario, Canada and in Victoria, Australia. Through 59 semi-structured interviews with bureaucrats and consultants in the two jurisdictions, this research describes the different patterns of involvement in the two cases. Consultants function as partners in policy formulation in Victoria and are routinely present in the policy network; while in Ontario they are members of the broader policy subsystem and are used infrequently for closely defined tasks. The paper draws out the main drivers and sources of the use of consulting firms in policy formulation. It identifies the legacies of NPM (new public management) and subsequent public sector reforms as core drivers for the variation in the role of consulting firms in the two cases. Gaps in policy capacity are directly connected to the use of consulting firms for substance-related aspects of the policy formulation. The fragmentation of the policy sector drives the use of consulting firms for external legitimacy and buy-in in process aspects of formulation. The analysis exposes the mechanisms that condition the use of consultants in policy formulation and offer insights as to the long-term impact of changes in public sector capacity and governance arrangements.

Ombudsman and hybridity

Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

The ombudsman institution has spread all over the world. It has had many variations and the institution is often understood as a legal overseer (a typical perception in the Nordic countries), as a mediator (particularly in the Mediterranean context), an institution of conflict resolution, and guardian of human rights and good governance. The ombudsman has been studied as a global “policy innovation” and the literature on the global diffusion of the ombudsman is linked to the UN's coordination on National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI) since the early 1990s. The different variants of the institution have also been discussed as “development phases” or “generations” of ombudsmen. The different types or generations of ombudsmen are now tending to converge conceptually or are arguably “hybridizing”, for example as ‘classical’ ombudsman institutions - such as the Finnish Parliamentary Ombudsman - are adopting the tasks of human rights institutions, advocates of good governance, and even as mediators alongside their role as legal overseer. This paper explores the institutional development of the ombudsman amid “hybridization” in the Nordic context.

(Virtual) Distributing public sector governance in Canada: the evolving use and implications of arms-length agencies.

Jennifer Hall (University of Victoria)

Governments around the world, including Canada, continue to look for new ways to structure themselves to address the growing demands of public service delivery and complexity of policy issues such as the impacts of environmental degradation; global industrialization and trade; fiscal crises; health pandemics; and the effects of political and cultural unrest and conflict. The solutions are not just about policy choices, administration and business practices. They fundamentally include public sector governance: the way governments choose to structure themselves and the processes, including decision-making, in which they engage to address increasingly complex public policy issues. One strategy has been to hive off functions to arms-length entities and this is true in Canada even though little is understood about the implications for outcomes such as accountability, performance, transparency and cost.

Research conducted for my dissertation looked at the current shape of the Canadian public sector by examining the use of arms length entities over time, and their impact on public sector governance. This paper uses the data from 32 interviews of current and past government and agency executives, in addition to a literature review and document analysis, to provide insights into the rationale for agency creation, relationships between government and its arms-length entities, and the impacts on public sector governance in two sub-national Canadian jurisdictions.

Data have shown that there has been a continued and statistically significant increase in the overall number of arms-length entities in both jurisdictions over time (Hall, 2021). Creation, though, ebbs and flows, and is not necessarily a reflection of political ideology or economic climate. While many Canadian provinces have developed governance frameworks for creating, managing, reshaping, and eliminating their Crown agencies, practice does not always follow theory in that, for example, political or stakeholder influence has not been eliminated in the creation of these bodies. Recognizing this, agencies have become more adept at reading political signals and building relationships with government that earn them trust and autonomy. All indications suggest that governments will continue to use arms-length agencies to deliver a variety of services with a continued lack of consistency in organizational forms and governance frameworks. As the public governance environment becomes more complex, we need to better understand why and how governments re-shape themselves and how this impacts outcomes such as accountability and performance; providing new opportunities for further research as the shape of the public sector continues to evolve.

Hall, Jennifer. (2021). *Agencification in Canada: Pulling Back the Veil of Arms-length Government*. Unpublished dissertation. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.

A critical assessment of the implementation and governance of the Access and Benefit-Sharing policies in Brazil

Biancca Castro (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Carlos Eduardo Frickmann Young (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro)

Bruno Borges Silvério Sebastião (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Brazil was one of the first countries to institute an access and benefit-sharing (ABS) policy, as advocated by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The policy, provisionally introduced in 2002, established a hybrid model for managing national genetic heritage and associated traditional knowledge. The Genetic Heritage Management Council (CGen), has the institutional power to coordinate the elaboration and implementation of this policy. Its original composition included only members from government and academia. Several changes occurred in the legislation over time, changing from provisional to permanent status and including the participation of new actors, such as business and the beneficiaries of the ABS policy (traditional communities and indigenous peoples).

This article presents the history of the ABS policy in Brazil, focusing on the role of CGen. The objective of the research is to show how changes in the interactions between government, business, academia, and policy beneficiaries have altered the policy's outcomes over time, especially after the implementation of Law n.13123 in 2015, which established new guidance on the subject.

The methodology is composed of the analysis of CGen management reports, available between 2003 and 2015, and the minutes of all council meetings held between 2016 and 2019, plus interviews with eleven members of CGen.

The analysis indicates that the claim and mobilization of different social sectors drove the changes that occurred over time in the composition of CGen. The inclusion of users (productive sector) and beneficiaries (traditional and indigenous communities) of the policy in CGen composition, nevertheless, has not helped to

increase the effectiveness of the policy in terms of benefit-sharing.

There is a minimum of 40% of civil society members in CGen members (the remaining are representatives of the Federal administration). But there is an unequal involvement of hearers in public assemblies: in the 24 assemblies analyzed, there were at least 173 hearers from 33 different companies, in contrast with only five hearers linked to the beneficiaries. Even though hearers do not have the power to vote on the topics discussed in the meetings, they can pressure and influence decisions made by the assembly.

In summary, the policy, over time, has allowed for greater participation of different actors in its organizational and institutional structure. However, this hybridization has not translated into greater effectiveness. Different rationality, interests, and the unequal correlation of forces have been found to have contributed to the fact that no benefit-sharing agreement has been reached. In addition, recent changes in government ideology have sought to remove the protagonist role of CGen and return to centralized decision-making.

T01W06 / Public policies for hybrid governance

Chair : Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Second Chair : Jarmo Vakkuri (Tampere University, Faculty of Management and Business)

Third Chair : Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

Session 3

Wednesday, June 29th 09:00 to 12:00 (C107)

(Virtual) Unpacking the local effects of transnational policy in higher education: The case of the European Universities Initiative

Romulo Pinheiro (University of Agder)

Unpacking the local effects of transnational policy in higher education:

The case of the European Universities Initiative

Stefan Gänzle and Rómulo Pinheiro, University of Agder, Norway

The European Universities Initiative (EUI) aims at “strengthening strategic partnerships across the EU between higher education institutions and encouraging the emergence by 2024 of some twenty 'European Universities', consisting of bottom-up university networks which will enable students to obtain a degree by combining studies in several EU countries and contribute to the international competitiveness of European universities” (European Council Conclusions of December 2017). As a transnational policy initiative, EUI represents a new phase in the institutionalisation of a supra-national European space for higher education and research, initiated by the Bologna and Lisbon processes, and the subsequent establishment of joint European areas for education and research alongside a set of key institutions like the European Research Council (ERC). This paper seeks to unpack some of the local effects accrued to EUI as a policy initiative by investigating its impact on structural arrangements within public universities as hybrid organisations. The case of the FORTHEM university consortia is used to illustrate ongoing developments and point to possible, future trajectories across Europe at large.

Private regulation for public organisations: The effect of voluntary quality certificates in higher education governance

Maarja Beerkens (Leiden University)

Hybridity characterizes not only semi-public organisations but increasingly also regulatory practices. It has become widely accepted that private actors can effectively take over some of the government tasks not only in service delivery but also in regulation. This has solidified the idea of ‘decentered regulation’ (Black, 2008) whereby regulatory regimes constitute a complex web of many and different types of regulatory agencies and actors. Next to traditional governmental regulation, self-regulation and voluntary regulatory initiatives by third parties are becoming increasingly prominent (Bartle and Vass, 2007; Bütte & Mattli, 2011; Djelic and Sahlin-Anderson, 2006). One form of such practices concerns various certificates and labels that are issued by societal partners with the aim to promote but also hold organisations accountable for certain public objectives. Examples include certificates that approve products and services with respect to environmental sustainability, animal welfare, labour conditions, gender equality, and many more (Cafaggi, 2011; Cafaggi and Renda, 2012).

Regulating with voluntary means is entering also the (semi-)public sector. It is not surprising considering that public management reforms have increased autonomy of many (semi-) public organisations, and created a distance between the government and its subunits (L?greid and Verhoest, 2010; Majone, 1997; Gilardi, 2008). We can thus observe a ‘regulation inside government’ phenomenon, i.e. steering the behavior of increasingly autonomous public agencies and service providers via various regulatory (and contractual) mechanisms (Hood et al. 1999). This opens a way not only to traditional governmental regulation, but also to private regulators.

While literature on voluntary regulation is accumulating rapidly, the studies are overwhelmingly from the

private sector. The role of private regulation in (semi-)public services is to a large extent unexplored, and will be addressed in this paper. In this paper we will focus on one specific certification schemes, a European-level initiative of internationalization certificates for higher education programs. Combining quantitative and qualitative evidence, we wish to examine whether a voluntary certification scheme has a positive effect in a public setting, and through what mechanisms. The paper makes use of a large longitudinal dataset to explore whether certified programs indeed perform differently than uncertified programs, and to understand how organisations adapt to such a voluntary certification scheme. A preliminary empirical analysis shows that certified study programs indeed perform better. Partly the effect can be explained by self-selection, as already well-performing programs are more likely to apply for a certificate, but there is also a significant independent effect. Followed by semi-structured interviews, the paper argues that a voluntary certification scheme can improve performance by strengthening motivation, commitment, and expertise, and thereby support organizational change.

References:

- Bartle, I. and Vass, P. 2007. Self-regulation within the regulatory state: Towards a new regulatory paradigm? *Public Administration*, 85(4): 885-905.
- Bartley, T. 2007. Institutional Emergence in an Era of Globalization: The Rise of Transnational Private Regulation of Labor and Environmental Conditions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(2):297-351.
- Bartley, T. 2011. Transnational governance as the layering of rules: Intersections of public and private standards. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, 12: 517-542.
- Black, J. 2008. Constructing and contesting legitimacy and accountability in polycentric regulatory regimes. *Regulation & Governance* 2(2): 137-164.
- Bu?the, T., and Walter Mattli. 2011. *The new global rulers : the privatization of regulation in the world economy*. Oxford ; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Cafaggi, F. 2011. New Foundations of Transnational Private Regulation. *Journal of Law and Society* 38(1): 20-49.
- Cafaggi, F., and Renda, A. 2012. *Public and Private Regulation: Mapping the Labyrinth*. CEPS Working Document no 370.
- Djelic, M.-L., and Sahlin-Andersson, K. 2006. *Transnational governance : institutional dynamics of regulation*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilardi, F. 2008. *Delegation in the regulatory state : independent regulatory agencies in Western Europe*. Cheltenham, UK ; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Hood, C., Scott, C., James, O., Jones, G., and Traves, T. (1999). *Regulation Inside Government: Waste Watchers, Quality Policy, and Sleaze-Busters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- L?greid, P., and Verhoest, K. 2010. Introduction: Reforming Public Sector Organizations. In *Governance of Public Sector Organizations: Proliferation, Autonomy and Performance*, P. L?greid and K. Verhoest, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Maxmillan.
- Majone, G. 1997. From the Positive to the Regulatory State: Causes and Consequences of Changes in the Mode of Governance. *Journal of Public Policy*, 17(02): 139-167.
- Verbruggen, P. 2013. Gorillas in the closet? Public and private actors in the enforcement of transnational private regulation. *Regulation & Governance*, 7(4): 512-532.

T01W06 / Public policies for hybrid governance

Chair : Jan-Erik Johanson (Tampere University)

Second Chair : Jarmo Vakkuri (Tampere University, Faculty of Management and Business)

Third Chair : Tero Erkkilä (University of Helsinki)

Session 4

Wednesday, June 29th 14:00 to 17:00 (C107)

(Virtual) Hybridity in financing for sustainable development: the case of energy sector

Olena Danylenko (Nord University)

Relevance of the paper to the panel topic – The paper corresponds to the panel “Public policies for hybrid governance” by focusing on variety in the sources of funding for societally important activities during global shift to sustainability in energy sector.

One way to minimise CO2 emissions from oil and gas business is to grow within renewable energy and for state to support such transition initiatives. Both public and private partners understand that going back to ‘normal’ activities is not an option if they want to build more resilient economies and sustainable development pathways that will benefit both the company’s financial interests and interests of citizens and environment. But changing such enormous energy systems will take time, resources, investments, willpower and absolute reshaping of managerial strategy, that is unique for every player of global energy market.

The global phenomenon of moving towards sustainability and decarbonization in energy sector, leaves the question of energy projects financing as an open option for discussions, mainly from the point of view of both big energy companies and governments as main “stakeholders” and acting forces of transition to sustainability.

Abstract Purpose – The paper seeks to understand how hybridity can be applied to study financing of large scale projects such as renewable energy projects withing broad review of relevant literature.

The significance of the research – The paper covers what is known about hybridity in finance with special focus of practical use of hybrid financing in large scale, innovative sustainable projects. This is the first literature review on how hybridity can be applied to study financing of renewable energy projects through two dimensions of hybridity, hybridity in project finance and hybridity in logics. Broad overview of theoretical basics of hybridity, project financing, hybrid financing will be used to study more deeply the role of hybridity in financing of renewable energy projects during global transition to decarbonization in two different jurisdictions of Norway and Ukraine.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper is built on systematic literature review, concerning the topic of hybridity, project finance, hybrid forms of financing in relation to sustainable development and energy transition. Articles from Databases such as Scopus and Web of Science Core collection and published in peer-review journals were used. Furthermore, the author proposes agendas for future research into hybrid financing of renewable energy projects.

The results to be reported – This paper examines innovative hybrid financing mechanisms in different sectors, such as sustainable infrastructure system projects, green energy projects, social enterprises, with the aim of further aligning some examples to potential needs of developers in the field of renewable energy (RE). Theoretical frameworks of institutional logics and hybrid financing describes and analyses hybridity in financing in the context of RE projects where public and private actors cooperate with the aim for sustainable development, showing which roles and how these roles are delegated among public and private actors and how government support of renewable energy is performed via hybrid forms of financing.

Keywords: hybrid financing, project finance, hybrid bond, green bonds, mezzanine financing.

Online participation

(Virtual) Effects of Public Private Partnership: A case of Adaptation for Smallholders to Climate Change (AdapCC)

Yumiko Takemae (Kyoto University)

Adaptation measures are essential particularly in countries that are vulnerable to climate change because the effects of climate change are frequent in many parts of the world, regardless of the efforts of mitigation measures. In adaptation measures, the role of the public sector is often considered important in such areas as adaptation planning and infrastructure development. However, it is pointed out that public-only adaptation measures are inadequate in terms of the scale of the problem, funding, capacity and risk burden (Lemos & Agrawal, 2006; Taylor & Harman, 2016). Given the imminent threat of climate change, it is not realistic to implement adaptation measures solely by the public sector. Under such circumstances, expectations are rising for the role of private companies to adaptation in terms of know-how, technology, funds (Agrawala et al., 2011; Pinkse & Kolk, 2012; Biagini & Miller, 2013). Indeed, adaptation is very valuable for private companies, given the impact on their operations, business opportunities, and pressures from customers and society (Agrawala et al., 2011; Biagini & Miller, 2013; CDP et al., 2015). Nevertheless, implementation of adaptation measures by private companies is limited by several factors, including lack of common definition of adaptation, a paucity of information, inadequate knowledge, the difficulty of making investment decisions due to the uncertainty of climate change, access to finance, and policies and regulations (Pinkse & Kolk, 2012; Biagini & Miller, 2013; CDP et al., 2015; Klein et al., 2018).

Public Private Partnership (PPP), which is often found in mitigation measures, has come to be noted as a means to overcome these constraints for public sectors and private companies (Agrawala et al., 2011; Biagini & Miller, 2013). Although PPP is a concept developed in the field of infrastructure and construction, it has also been introduced in other areas, including climate change in recent years. In general, public sectors and private companies expect PPP to provide timely, cost-effective and high-quality services to the community, cross-leveraging their resources, investment returns and risk sharing (Linder, 1999; Ng and Loosemore, 2006; Cumming, 2007; Tang et al., 2010; Pinkse and Kolk, 2012). In the food security sector, where resilience of people vulnerable to climate change is an urgent issue, few studies have addressed the benefits of PPP. Therefore, this study clarifies the effect of PPP in this field.

This paper begins by reviewing the issues concerning adaptation to climate change. Next, it introduces the concept of PPP and overviews the benefits of PPP for climate change, especially adaptation. Then, Adaptation for Smallholders to Climate Change (AdapCC), a project that helps ensure food security for small coffee farmers, is shown as a case study of PPP. This study uses frameworks to clarify the position of AdapCC in climate governance and the motivation for the project. Based on this case, the benefits of PPP for adaptation measures will be discussed. Through the case study of the hybrid project between public and private actors, this paper contributes to the workshop by empirically demonstrating the rationality of collaboration.